

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/657,062	09/05/2003	Steve Hoffman	9436-09 CI2 (184253)	9095
7590 08/02/2004			EXAMINER	
Robert Cannuscio			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
Drinker Biddle	& Reath LLP			
One Logan Square			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
18th & Cherry Streets			3723	
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996			DATE MAILED, 09/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,062	HOFFMAN, STEVE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M Rachuba	3723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPORTED THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a receif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tild ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.	·	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7,8,13 and 14 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to be a constant.	dare: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected or b)□ obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Into have been received in Applicate ority documents have been received in the contract of the contra	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/5/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	•	

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman 5,355,638 in view of Olson et al, 3,371,449.
- 3. '638 discloses the claimed invention except for the use of a fixture so that each tool is spaced from an adjacent tool, and placing the fixture into the vessel, and the fixture mounted to the vessel wall. Further, '638 does not disclose the claimed rotational speeds or times of processing. Regarding the use of a fixture, '449, figures 3-5, teaches the use of a fixture for mounting workpieces to be processed in a tumbling device, the workpieces mounted so that they are spaced from an adjacent workpiece, and the fixture mounted to the walls of the tumbling vessel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided '638 with the fixture of '449, column 5, lines 67-71, to provide uniform finishing of the surfaces of the workpieces.

Regarding the claimed rotational speeds and processing times, '638 discloses that "One use of the prototype has been to polish zirconia balls for use in medical applications in a two-stage polishing operation. The as-machined zirconia, including lathe machine marks, is smoothed in a first polishing stage that lasts about 1.5 hours using 30 micron diamond abrasive media, then is given a high shine in a second

Art Unit: 3723

polishing stage that lasts about 1 hour at 325 rpm using 9 micron diamond abrasive media." It is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided '638 as modified by '449 with the claimed processing speeds and times, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Here, '638 clearly discloses that it is old and well known to process workpieces at two different rotational speeds, for two different time periods, using two different abrasives. That applicant has found the optimum time and rotational speeds for a specific workpiece of specific material and surface characteristics involves routine skill. Further, that during the second stage the processing occurs at a second, and then a third slower stage is inherent to the device, as it does not come to an instantaneous stop when the processing ends.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7, 8, 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar tumbling methods are cited of interest.

Application/Control Number: 10/657,062

Art Unit: 3723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M Rachuba whose telephone number is 703-308-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail, can be reached on (703) 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Rachuba

Primary Patent Examiner

29-Jul-04